Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1055/15 Recommendation – APPROVE

Site: 24 Mill Lane, Shoreham

Proposal: Single storey flat roof side extension

Date of site visit: 22.09.15

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

The application site is a corner plot located to the west of The Close and to the north of Mill Lane. The Shoreham Conservation Area boundary runs parallel to the application site on the opposite side of Mill Lane.

The road comprises a mix of terraced house on smaller plots and larger two storey semi-detached and detached houses on larger plots. The property forms one half of a pair of semi-detached two storey dwellings which have a uniform appearance - projecting two storey bay window features, brick detailed arched entrance doors, front chimneys and brick quoin detailing.

This application seeks permission to construct a single storey extension to the east side of the dwelling with wedged footprint. This is flat roof with a perimeter parapet. It will measure approx. 3.3 metres in height, 8.9 metres in length, and 4.9 metres in width.

This application is a resubmission of a previously refused application (AWDM/1815/14 refers).

Consultations: None received.
Representations: None received**.**

Planning History
AWDM/1815/14
SINGLE STOREY FLAT ROOF SIDE EXTENSION
Refused 12/05/2015

Relevant Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (CLG 2012)
Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7, AB4 and Appendix 11 ‘Supplementary Planning Guidance’ comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’

Planning Assessment

Principle

Upgrading of residential accommodation is acceptable in principle, subject to satisfying the statutory test for development affecting the setting of a Conservation Area.

Visual amenity and Heritage Assets

The previous planning application was refused because amended plans were not received in time to meet the expiry date.

Amended plans were necessary because the planning officer for that application identified issues with the scheme's visual impact. The officer recommended setting the extension back at least 1 metre from the east boundary, and setting its front wall back from the dwellinghouse.

This was believed adequate to negate the visual harm - the consequential reduction in width, bulk and proximity to the east boundary meant the extension would relate satisfactorily to the scale and appearance of the dwelling and no longer constitute an intrusive addition.

In this current application, the proposed extension has been redesigned to reflect this advice. The outside wall is set off from the east boundary by 1 metre, and its front wall set back from the original wall of the dwellinghouse. The exterior materials and finishes would match the main house or be appropriately domestic. The parapet detail is an appropriate treatment for the age of the host building. The side door is a new element to the extension flank compared to the previous scheme. However this would be hidden behind the boundary fence and not visually obtrusive. It would have a domestic appearance.

No quoining is proposed on the extension. The low level kitchen window is a quirky feature but it would be concealed behind existing boundary treatment, so would not be harmful visually. There is a drafting error on the drawing – the intent is that brick on edge parapet with tile coursing will run the entire length of the extension. This can be secured by a way of a planning condition.

For these reasons visual harm would no longer arise, and the setting of the Conservation Area with its special qualities would be preserved.

Residential amenity

As before, the proposed extension would be located to the easterly side of the property so it would be well distanced from any neighbouring occupiers to the east by The Drive.

The proposed rear set of doors would be distanced to the northerly neighbouring garden by 14.5 metres. Given the separation distance involved the proposed extension would cause no loss of privacy to the amenity of the northerly neighbouring occupiers.

Recommendation

Approve

Subject to following conditions

1. Standard time limit
2. Approved Plans
3. Exterior materials/finishes to match existing

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Is recommendation contrary to letter(s) of representation? N

Case Officer:	Matthew Porter	Date: 19-11-2015
Authorised by:	Jo Morin	Date: 20.11.2015